

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - WESTERN DIVISION  
HONORABLE S. JAMES OTERO, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, )  
)  
Plaintiff, ) Case No.  
) ED CV 18-2104-SJO  
vs. )  
)  
JASON CARDIFF, ET AL., )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: CONTEMPT (CONTINUED)  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 2019  
10:07 A.M.  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAREA WOOLRICH, CSR 12698, CCRR  
FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER  
350 WEST FIRST STREET, SUITE 4311  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
mareawoolrich@aol.com

**APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:**

**FOR THE PLAINTIFF:**

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION  
BY: ELIZABETH JONES SANGER  
JAMES A. PRUNTY  
EDWIN RODRIGUEZ  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20580  
(202) 326-2757

**FOR THE RECEIVER ROBB EVANS & ASSOCIATES, LLC:**

FRANDZEL, ROBINS, BLOOM & CSAT, LC  
BY: MICHAEL G. FLETCHER  
1000 Wilshire Boulevard, 19th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
(323) 852-1000

**FOR THE DEFENDANTS:**

THURMAN LEGAL  
BY: MICHAEL A. THURMAN  
1055 East Colorado Blvd., 5th Floor  
Pasadena, CA 91106  
(626) 399-6205

**FOR THE OBJECTOR JACQUES POUJADE:**

SPERTUS, LANDES & UMHOFFER  
BY: JAMES SPERTUS  
M. ANTHONY BROWN  
1990 S. Bundy Drive, Suite 705  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(310) 826-4700

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 2019

2 10:07 A.M.

3 -oOo-

4  
5 THE CLERK: Calling Item No. 1, Case No. ED CV  
6 18-02104 SJO, Federal Trade Commission versus Jason Cardiff,  
7 et al.

8 Counsel, would you please state your appearances.

9 And everyone in the audience can be seated, please.

10 MS. SANGER: Elizabeth Sanger, Federal Trade  
11 Commission.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Edwin Rodriguez for the Federal  
13 Trade Commission.

14 MR. PRUNTY: James Prunty for the Federal Trade  
15 Commission.

16 MR. FLETCHER: Good morning, Your Honor.  
17 Mike Fletcher, Frandzel Robins, on behalf of the receiver.

18 MR. THURMAN: Good morning, Your Honor.  
19 Michael Thurman on behalf of Defendants Jason and Eunjung  
20 Cardiff.

21 MR. SPERTUS: Good morning, Your Honor.  
22 James Spertus and Tony Brown on behalf of nonparty Jacques  
23 Poujade. He's present before the Court.

24 THE COURT: Any other appearances? Good morning,  
25 everyone. Have a seat.

1           So the matter is here on the continued order to show  
2     cause. The parties have filed numerous pleadings and documents  
3     in this case which the Court has reviewed. I also have spent  
4     some time reviewing the proposed findings of fact and  
5     conclusions offered by the FTC, objections thereto by  
6     Mr. Poujade or Poujade's counsel and objections thereto by the  
7     Cardiffs.

8           So I've been in the process of trying to finalize  
9     those proposed findings. That being said, there has been  
10    some -- certain recent filings by Mr. Spertus or counsel for  
11    Mr. Poujade that may be helpful in narrowing certain issues.

12           Since the last hearing, it's been brought to the  
13    Court's attention that True Pharmastrip's board of directors  
14    authorized a deposit of 1.56 million Canadian into the Spertus  
15    trust account to bring those assets before the Court and, in  
16    part, remove any threat of dissipation.

17           And so Mr. Spertus has advanced the following: That  
18    there are only three remaining issues for resolution at today's  
19    hearing, and he's identified those issues as the amount that  
20    True Pharmastrip should preserve during the pendency of this  
21    case, the location where any preserved funds should reside, and  
22    whether the receiver should return the True Pharmastrip  
23    manufacturing machines that the Court ordered Mr. Poujade to  
24    deliver to the receiver at the last hearing.

25           There is a claim that the order -- the Court's order

1 regarding the machines at the last hearing was a bit ambiguous.  
2 I didn't interpret my comments to be ambiguous. I believe I  
3 ordered that the machines to be turned over to the receiver.  
4 As I understand it, there are two machines -- there may be  
5 more, but there are at least two machines, one located in  
6 Cathedral City, and I believe the receiver has custody or  
7 control of that, and then maybe one located in Colorado  
8 someplace.

9 MR. FLETCHER: That's correct, Your Honor. Mike  
10 Fletcher on behalf of the receiver. There's a machine in  
11 Cathedral City that's in the possession of the receiver. There  
12 is a machine that we call the Colorado machine, location  
13 unknown, and based on some recent financial records, there may  
14 be a third.

15 THE COURT: I think you need to speak into the  
16 microphone for the record and for me also, please.

17 MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Your Honor. My apologies  
18 to the Court. Mike Fletcher, Frandzel Robins, on behalf of the  
19 receiver.

20 There is a machine that's in Cathedral City that is  
21 in the receiver's custody and possession. We are aware of a  
22 second machine that we call the Colorado machine, location  
23 unknown. And based on some financial records turned over that  
24 the receiver saw over the weekend, there may be a third  
25 machine, also location unknown. So we have one machine in

1 custody and one not.

2 THE COURT: One unknown location?

3 MR. FLETCHER: The Colorado machine's location is  
4 unknown. And there could be, based on the financial records, a  
5 third machine, also location unknown.

6 THE COURT: Okay. So we'll come back to the machine  
7 issue.

8 MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: So in reference to the 1.56 million  
10 or -- 1.56 million Canadian that has been transferred to this  
11 Spertus trust account, I think that's a major movement in the  
12 right direction. In terms of where those funds should remain,  
13 as I mentioned, the funds are in the trust account of  
14 Mr. Spertus. I think, you know, the reputation of the Spertus  
15 firm speaks for itself. There is little risk that these funds  
16 would be unlawfully dissipated.

17 That being said, the orders issued by this Court, in  
18 particular the TRO order, ordered that all assets be turned  
19 over to the receiver and not merely that they be shielded from  
20 dissipation. So it's the role of the receiver to protect and  
21 manage these assets, and it would appear to the Court that the  
22 funds should be turned over to the receiver with a final  
23 determination as to who the funds belong to at some later point  
24 in time. I think if that is accomplished, then much of the  
25 issues before the Court would be resolved.

1           We have -- separate and apart from the 1.56, there  
2           was -- the FTC has been pursuing the 2.2 million Canadian  
3           deposited directly with Pharmastrip. And the FTC's position is  
4           that that should be subject -- should be the subject of the  
5           asset freeze also. And so that issue really depends on whether  
6           there is a clear and convincing evidence that has been offered  
7           here that would allow the Court to conclude that the Cardiffs  
8           owned and control those assets either directly or indirectly.

9           Based on what I've heard so far, the tentative would  
10          be for the Court to conclude that that has not been  
11          established. The 2.2 has -- that has not been established by  
12          clear and convincing evidence. That may change if there's  
13          other evidence that's provided.

14          In reference to the machines themselves and whether  
15          the machines are subject to the asset freeze depends on whether  
16          they are owned and paid for by the Clover Cannastrip or by  
17          Pharmastrip. And so there may be some additional issues there  
18          to discuss.

19          In reference to compliance with other orders, it  
20          would appear that the defendants must still provide a detailed  
21          accounting of all assets removed from Clover Cannastrip's  
22          account. The FTC should be in a position where they should be  
23          able to trace a direct line between the funds leaving a Clover  
24          Cannastrip account, and the defendants -- Cardiffs should  
25          provide all information that would allow that tracing. So that

1 needs to be done.

2           So I guess the question is if -- and I think we have  
3 certain members of the board of the directors here who have  
4 authorized a transfer. I have -- separate and apart from the  
5 pleadings, there's -- there was an objection by Mr. Poujade to  
6 the receiver's third affidavit of noncompliance. And attached  
7 to that objection -- well, I'm sorry. Separate and apart from  
8 that pleading there was evidence offered in support of nonparty  
9 Poujade's objections. And attached to that were various  
10 declarations from the board of directors of True Pharmastrip.

11           And the board of directors have authorized the  
12 transfer of the 5.56 (sic) into Mr. Spertus' account. If the  
13 board would agree and everyone would agree to have those funds  
14 transferred into the custody and control of the receiver with  
15 determination to be laid -- to be made later on as to who is --  
16 who should be in rightful possession of those funds, then that  
17 would resolve a lot. If not, the Court is prepared to go on  
18 with the findings of fact and conclusions of law.

19           So I'll hear from Mr. Spertus.

20           MR. SPERTUS: Thank you, Your Honor.

21           THE COURT: As an aside, as a housekeeping matter, I  
22 should say that one of my law clerks has recently been offered  
23 a position with the Spertus firm, and this Court -- it was by  
24 coincidence only, and this Court has made sure that that person  
25 has been walled off from these proceedings here.



1 MR. SPERTUS: Your Honor, I appreciate the Court's  
2 overview. And our goal is to avoid any contempt findings  
3 whatsoever against Mr. Poujade. So the 1.56 million was set  
4 aside to ensure that ownership of it can be resolved in an  
5 orderly way through discovery. The one alternative to turning  
6 it over to the receiver is that we interplead the funds with  
7 the Court in an action in the nature of interpleader which  
8 would allow True Pharmastrip to participate in discovery.

9 Because right now the challenge for the company is  
10 that Mr. Cardiff lied to, I guess, the Glaser Weil firm, said  
11 this money was his when it was not. Hopefully today  
12 Mr. Cardiff will own that statement as being untrue. But  
13 that's become the foundation for the Court's understandable  
14 view that the money was Jason Cardiff's money. It was not.

15 And the board of directors declarations are to try  
16 to explain to the Court that True Pharmastrip is a very  
17 legitimate company led by business leaders who are very  
18 accomplished and believe in a mission. And Jason Cardiff,  
19 although he was at one point in time a founder, has nothing to  
20 do with the company today. And he's a complete stranger today  
21 to --

22 THE COURT: Look, I've heard this before.

23 MR. SPERTUS: I know.

24 THE COURT: And so much of this is credibility  
25 determinations. Mr. Cardiff's statements to you or to the

1 Court are simply statements that are hard to accept as being  
2 true and correct. So he's lost all credibility --

3 MR. SPERTUS: And he should have none. That's fine.  
4 Assume Mr. Cardiff has zero credibility.

5 THE COURT: So separate and apart from that, let me  
6 hear from Mr. Fletcher regarding where the funds should be  
7 deposited.

8 MR. SPERTUS: And, Your Honor, may I return later to  
9 discuss the amount issue?

10 THE COURT: Yes.

11 MR. SPERTUS: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Your Honor. Mike  
13 Fletcher, Frandzel Robins, on behalf of the receiver.

14 The receiver would concur that the funds should be  
15 deposited with the receiver. They can be accounted for in such  
16 a way that obviously nothing is going to happen to the funds  
17 until -- unless the Court makes rulings as to where that money  
18 should go.

19 THE COURT: Sure.

20 MR. FLETCHER: While this has nothing to do with  
21 Mr. Spertus and his firm, those funds were subject to potential  
22 levy by third parties if they learn about them. And the only  
23 place that they can be safely stashed as far as we're aware is  
24 with the receiver. So the receiver would concur in that  
25 regard.

1 THE COURT: Okay. The Court -- I'll hear more from  
2 Mr. Spertus. But, Mr. Spertus, it would appear -- look, the  
3 order previously issued by the Court, the order was clear that  
4 the assets are to be turned over to the receiver, and it's the  
5 role of the receiver to protect and manage those assets. I  
6 recognize that there's certain other third party claims  
7 regarding those assets, and those issues can be resolved later  
8 on so everyone is protected. But that would be -- that would  
9 seem to be consistent with the prior orders of the Court.

10 MR. SPERTUS: The prior orders of the Court are the  
11 TRO. That's what brings us all here today. May I approach the  
12 lectern, Your Honor?

13 THE COURT: Yes.

14 MR. SPERTUS: And I -- I understand we are not going  
15 to solve all issues today. So the suggestion that the funds be  
16 interplead is a tool to --

17 THE COURT: I'm not going to agree to it.

18 MR. SPERTUS: Okay. You're not going to agree.

19 So there is a question of whether or not those  
20 assets fall within the language of the TRO, and I'd like just  
21 to ensure True Pharmastrip can defend that those funds are its  
22 own, were not Jason Cardiff's at any time. They came from  
23 third-party innocent investors who invested in True Pharmastrip  
24 who didn't even know the name Jason Cardiff. And through an  
25 orderly discovery process, we are going to develop those facts.

1           If we assumed for purposes of discussion  
2     Jason Cardiff has zero credibility, that means his statement  
3     that the funds were his own is itself something that shouldn't  
4     be believed. We think in an orderly way through discovery we  
5     will establish it's not his money.

6           THE COURT: There are certain statements that the  
7     Court would accept as true from Mr. Cardiff, one being a  
8     statement he made under oath at the last hearing regarding  
9     certain advice by Mr. White, his former lawyer, concerning a  
10    passport, and certain statements that the Court would not  
11    accept. So I'm not sure where you want to go with this.

12           MR. SPERTUS: I agree. We are not defending him.  
13    We agree with the Court's evaluation of Mr. Cardiff. We are  
14    joined in that issue.

15           What I want to submit to the Court is that True  
16    Pharmastrip, the entity, is also a victim of Jason Cardiff. We  
17    want to develop that through discovery. As the Court knows,  
18    True Pharmastrip today still can't attend a deposition, can't  
19    issue a subpoena, can't present evidence in an orderly fashion.  
20    We are an outsider to this case.

21           So all I want to do is if the funds get deposited  
22    with the receiver as opposed to intervention, which would allow  
23    us to make the claim that it's our money, how do we pursue that  
24    claim without filing a separate action and relating it to this  
25    case?

1 THE COURT: Mr. Fletcher?

2 MR. FLETCHER: I have a suggestion, Your Honor.  
3 Thank you.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. FLETCHER: Again, Your Honor, Mike Fletcher on  
6 behalf of the receiver.

7 I can understand counsel's concerns, and I will  
8 inform the Court this counsel and his client are not the only  
9 potential claimants in the receivership estate who have  
10 expressed similar concerns. And what the receiver has told  
11 everyone else who has expressed such a concern is when and if  
12 there is any sort of claims process set up, everyone will be  
13 given notice of it.

14 If and when anyone is attempting to get an order  
15 from this Court about any particular asset in which they have  
16 an interest, the receiver will make sure that they all know  
17 about it and that an appropriate process can be set up where  
18 everybody can have their discovery if they need it, their day  
19 in court if they need it.

20 It's not just counsel and True Pharmastrip. The  
21 same issues have been raised with regard to a creditor named  
22 InterMedia and their legal counsel, a creditor named Auctus and  
23 their legal counsel. And across the board, the receiver has  
24 said that there will be a claims process. Everyone will have  
25 an opportunity to say whatever it is that they think they need

1 to say.

2 If they need discovery, the receiver will certainly  
3 participate in a process to effectuate whatever discovery they  
4 may think they need. And that question is a separate question  
5 from where the assets ought to be turned over to the receiver.

6 So I think there's a process to do this. And  
7 certainly the receiver is cognizant of it, and we have been  
8 dealing with it with other potential claimants.

9 MR. SPERTUS: Your Honor, one point of  
10 clarification. Each entity that the receiver just listed is a  
11 creditor of the Redwood Scientific entity seeking restitution.  
12 The True Pharmastrip is saying this is not Jason Cardiff's  
13 money. We are not seeking restitution. We are -- I created an  
14 analogy in our briefing to a bank robber who steals \$10,000.  
15 We are the victim bank. We want our property back.

16 And what I'm -- what I am in need of is the  
17 discovery tool that civil litigation affords parties to develop  
18 that this is not a receivership asset in the end and shouldn't  
19 be available for restitution to any Jason Cardiff victims.

20 THE COURT: So all I can say is that the Court is  
21 prepared today to order the funds to be transferred to the  
22 custody of the receiver and to -- if you have concerns  
23 regarding the final disposition of those funds at a later date  
24 in time, your client will have its day in court to make certain  
25 claims and provide evidence to the Court that suggests that

1 your client was duped by the Cardiffs and the monies deposited  
2 are rightfully your client's. There may be other claimants  
3 also here.

4 MR. SPERTUS: Right. And the additional claim that  
5 it is not a TRO -- it is not a receivership asset. We are  
6 parking the money -- we will deposit whatever the Court orders  
7 with the receiver to eliminate and take off the table the  
8 threat of dissipation. That's not happening.

9 But we do want to argue and establish through facts  
10 that this is not a receivership asset. It doesn't fall within  
11 the scope of the TRO, and we'll make that point later.

12 THE COURT: Yes. And I don't think anyone is -- I  
13 don't think there's any disagreement there. It seems that you  
14 should have -- your client should have their day -- its day in  
15 court regarding whether the funds, you know, rightfully belong  
16 to -- or portions of the funds rightfully belong to your  
17 client.

18 MR. SPERTUS: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 And then the last remaining issue, and then I think  
20 we've accomplished the goals, is that the amount -- you know,  
21 Mr. Poujade was brought before the Court because at the time,  
22 unaware of some of the facts that have now become known, he was  
23 paying Mr. Cardiff's expenses, and the amount was 490,000, that  
24 in the notice in the motion for OSC re contempt the FTC and  
25 receiver sought to have Mr. Poujade brought before the Court to

1 replenish \$490,000 of funds.

2           And the citations in that briefing, because it's  
3 fixed, is -- I'll provide to the Court in a second. But  
4 Docket 134.2, page 29. And so with that amount is what brought  
5 Mr. Poujade before the Court in the first place, I'd ask that  
6 only \$490,000 be replenished, which was the request, and then  
7 we'll make our claim for the money back at a future date after  
8 a hearing.

9           MR. FLETCHER: With regard to the first issue,  
10 Your Honor, from the receiver's perspective, the receiver takes  
11 a broad view of what a claim is. A claim is a claim is a claim  
12 whatever the basis of it is. With regard to amounts, I'm going  
13 to leave that to the FTC, Your Honor.

14           MS. SANGER: Your Honor, I would request to be heard  
15 on the issue of the amount.

16           THE COURT: Yes, absolutely.

17           MS. SANGER: Your Honor, Liz Sanger for the Federal  
18 Trade Commission.

19           Unfortunately, the \$1.56 million that has been the  
20 subject of much of this pleading is just the tip of the  
21 iceberg. And the FTC did receive a production on Thursday  
22 night from Mr. Poujade containing financial statements and  
23 reproduced and augmented Sui trust account statements marked  
24 with a confidential mark that contain troubling discrepancies  
25 between documents that were previously produced to the FTC and



1 to which we placed into the record as well as additional  
2 information about the amount that we are talking about here.

3 Now, these documents do bear a confidential stamp.  
4 There's no protective order in the case at this point. The FTC  
5 would like to discuss these documents with the Court today  
6 because they bear on the remedies that the FTC is seeking for  
7 the contempt of Mr. and Mrs. Cardiff as well as Mr. Poujade.

8 And I have prepared some slides comparing the  
9 documents that are already on the open record with reproduced  
10 documents and then the additional documents obviously bearing  
11 that confidential seal will need to be dealt with in some  
12 manner today. We don't believe that they are properly marked  
13 as confidential or they should be sealed. But we would  
14 encourage the Court to ask Mr. Spertus or Mr. Poujade's counsel  
15 to justify why those should not be entered into the record  
16 today and subject to the discussion about the turnover amount.

17 And then I'll just reiterate not only did the Court  
18 find Mr. and Mrs. Cardiff to be totally unbelievable at the  
19 last hearing, but there are also credibility findings as to  
20 Mr. Poujade's credibility. And given this latest information  
21 that has been produced to us, we believe there is even further  
22 grounds for the Court to call into question the credibility of  
23 documents that have been provided to the FTC to date in this  
24 case.

25 And regarding the order interpretation issue,

1 Mr. Poujade's counsel did argue this issue at the last  
2 three-day hearing and has already had an opportunity to present  
3 to the court its views on how the Court should interpret its  
4 orders.

5 THE COURT: So I'm hearing from the FTC that the  
6 1.56 million is not enough.

7 But that being said, the 1.56 million has been  
8 deposited into your account, Mr. Spertus, or the firm's  
9 account, and it would appear to the Court that all of that  
10 should be provided to the -- or placed in the custody and  
11 control of the receiver.

12 MR. SPERTUS: Okay, Your Honor. Thank you.

13 And, Your Honor, since the basis for the Court's  
14 order was that the True Pharmastrip machines were purchased  
15 with that money transferred out right before the TRO issued, a  
16 natural corollary would be that True Pharmastrip should get its  
17 machines back.

18 And I'd like to request that the Court order the  
19 receiver to return the machines currently in its possession.  
20 There's only a second machine. It's being transported and will  
21 arrive tomorrow at the Cathedral City location where the  
22 receiver is holding the first machine.

23 And we did try and meet and confer as the Court  
24 ordered last Wednesday and were unsuccessful in persuading the  
25 receiver to accept the cash that was used to buy the machines

1 and return the machines. So with a deposit of 1.56 million  
2 Canadian, which is a lower amount in United States dollars,  
3 with the receiver, will the Court order the machine returned?

4 THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure what the value of the  
5 machines are.

6 MR. SPERTUS: About \$120,000 each ballpark. They  
7 are purchased from China. They are expensive. But most  
8 importantly, later in this case the Court will see that True  
9 Pharmastrip has nothing to do with Jason Cardiff any longer.  
10 Other than in August 2018, in that time frame, we've separated  
11 from him entirely and want to continue with the business that  
12 the investors invested in. So to enable that to happen, we  
13 need the machines back.

14 And with regard to the FTC's argument about the  
15 amount, the -- I mean, the goal posts have been moving  
16 continuously throughout these contempt proceedings. When the  
17 contempt proceedings are over, that won't be the end of the  
18 issues, and the FTC can raise in an orderly way claims for  
19 different amounts of money.

20 But I do want the Court to be aware that, you know,  
21 Dana Rohrabacher is present before Your Honor. Ralph Olson,  
22 Kamlesh Shaw is not because his wife is receiving a medical  
23 treatment today. And Anton Drescher is before the Court. All  
24 have traveled from far away. Mr. Rohrabacher flew in yesterday  
25 from Maine, Mr. Olsen from Denver, and Mr. Drescher from

1 Vancouver.

2           These are prominent businesspeople who are raising  
3 funds and pursuing a business objective that they believe in.  
4 And to have the receiver claim that this ongoing business is  
5 a -- related to the Redwood businesses that brought Mr. Cardiff  
6 before the Court is just not true. And so we will develop that  
7 in an orderly way later.

8           We just need the contempt proceedings to end. So we  
9 will deposit the 1.56 million and hopefully get the machines  
10 back which --

11           THE COURT: And I have -- -- look, this proceeding  
12 has gone on far too long. I think we had two and a half days  
13 of hearings last time. And, you know, I've expressed my  
14 opinions regarding the Cardiffs. And they've significantly  
15 complicated matters.

16           I do appreciate the board of directors for  
17 Pharmastrip authorizing the transfer of the funds into your  
18 account so that we could narrow the proceedings today and  
19 hopefully move on and the Court can attend to other business it  
20 has.

21           In reference to the machines, let me -- let me hear  
22 from the receiver. And then I'll hear from the FTC. So what  
23 I'm hearing from Pharmastrip is that the machines are important  
24 to them not so much in terms of the value of the machines but  
25 in terms of their ability to move forward with their business.

1 And so that certainly is a concern of the Court.

2 MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Your Honor. Mike Fletcher  
3 on behalf of the receiver.

4 First, if there is another machine and it's being  
5 delivered to the Cathedral City location and if this Court  
6 concludes that the machines should stay in the receiver's  
7 possession, the receiver -- this is the first we've heard about  
8 it -- the receiver will make arrangements then to have that  
9 second machine sequestered in the Cathedral City location.  
10 That's the first thing.

11 The second thing is requests were made of the  
12 receiver not to proceed with regard to this Court's July 31  
13 order to turn over the machines.

14 THE COURT: Yes.

15 MR. FLETCHER: The receiver declined. The receiver  
16 basically told counsel, well, if you don't like the order, go  
17 back to the Court. But the order is the order is the order.

18 THE COURT: The order issued orally. There wasn't a  
19 written order that followed, but the order was clear, yes.

20 MR. FLETCHER: That's correct. And in point of  
21 fact, I believe the Poujade side understood the Court's order  
22 because I immediately was in negotiations and consultation with  
23 Poujade's counsel which effectuated the turnover of the first  
24 machine.

25 THE COURT: I understood my order. So I'm surprised

1 that others did not.

2 MR. FLETCHER: With regard to -- the Poujade side  
3 has advanced two arguments. One is that the 1,560,000 Canadian  
4 is a stand-in for the machine, and they've been told that the  
5 accounting has been not made. The FTC apparently received some  
6 additional information late Thursday/Friday. The receiver  
7 didn't get it until Saturday midday. I don't know of a tracing  
8 that can be made in that regard.

9 The second issue is that it's the receiver's  
10 understanding that the FTC position is that the Cardiffs were  
11 engaged in a common enterprise with Redwood of which these  
12 machines were part. And so for both of these reasons, the  
13 receiver understood that's why the machines were to be taken  
14 into custody.

15 We've done no independent evaluation of the value of  
16 the machine. What counsel mentioned here is roughly akin to  
17 what I've heard other people indicate was the value of the  
18 machines.

19 With regard to the ongoing operation, that is an  
20 issue for the Court's determination, which from my  
21 understanding has already been made, but I'm not going to  
22 presume what the Court believes in that regard, that the way  
23 Jason Cardiff dealt with these machines is part and parcel of  
24 the underlying common enterprise with Redwood and similar thin  
25 strip dissolvable materials.

1           So for those reasons the receiver believes both  
2 machines should be taken into custody. And if there is no  
3 third machine, so be it. We stand ready to do that. And to  
4 the extent the Court determines that the machines should not be  
5 in custody, the receiver stands ready to turn it over  
6 immediately.

7           THE COURT: So is there a remedy in between where  
8 the machines can be placed in a location that would allow  
9 Pharmastrip to be able to use the machines and then a final  
10 determination later on made as to who probably owns them?

11           MR. FLETCHER: I believe that the answer is  
12 partially yes. The Cathedral City location to my understanding  
13 includes one machine that is in custody that's in a clean room  
14 setting. We've done nothing to determine the operational  
15 status of that machine, but we have no reason to believe that  
16 it cannot be allowed to be operated.

17           Whether and to what extent the second machine can go  
18 in that location, I don't know. But assuming that it can,  
19 consistent with the claims that have been made about it needing  
20 to be in a clean environment, presumably both machines could be  
21 kept in place in Cathedral City and operated in such a way they  
22 are not being deteriorated in value presumably.

23           THE COURT: Mr. Spertus, what's your view on that?

24           MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Your Honor.

25           MR. SPERTUS: Thank you, Your Honor.

1           Your Honor, I have three points. First, I don't  
2 believe that there's any dispute that Mr. Cardiff's Redwood  
3 Scientific business purchases thin strips abroad in China and  
4 India and had nothing to do with the manufacturing process.  
5 These machines were never used by Jason Cardiff's Redwood  
6 Scientific businesses. They are only True Pharmastrip  
7 businesses which is manufacturing for the THC strips, and those  
8 are very tightly regulated.

9           So the machine in California is regulated under  
10 California law. Although we've transported it to Colorado and  
11 back, the machine in Colorado will be operated in Colorado. It  
12 can't be operated in California and shipped to Colorado. So  
13 it's very complicated. There are a lot of lawyers advising the  
14 company in the different states on how to comply with laws.

15           I hope the Court understands these machines can't be  
16 vaporized and disappear into air. If the Court ever ordered  
17 the machines surrendered to the receiver in the future, we  
18 would gather them, shut down those businesses, and ship them to  
19 the receiver. They aren't at risk of dissipation. They would  
20 require forklifts and trucks to move.

21           So the Court could simply say to True Pharmastrip,  
22 which isn't even a party, that operate the machines subject to  
23 future orders, don't sell them to other business. And then  
24 True Pharmastrip will always be answerable to the Court because  
25 it will, through subsidiaries, maintain control over those



1 machines until this case is concluded. I just don't think we  
2 can have a solution where the receivership supervises that  
3 possessory interest.

4 THE COURT: Thank you.

5 Then let me hear from Ms. Sanger regarding the  
6 machines.

7 MS. SANGER: Is the screen turning up blank?

8 THE COURT: There's a --

9 MS. SANGER: Okay. Well, I'll do without  
10 demonstratives because I don't want to waste the Court's time  
11 here. I do want to refer back to some information that was  
12 discussed in quite some level of detail at the last hearing and  
13 this regards the initial deposits made for the machines at  
14 issue.

15 There's evidence in the record at Docket 144-1 as  
16 well as in the receiver's second affidavit of the Cardiffs'  
17 noncompliance that Mr. Cardiff made deposits on the machines  
18 from the TD Canada account in the name of Clover Cannastrip on  
19 October 9th, 2018. There were two deposits made in the amounts  
20 of \$35,110 U.S. Mr. Cardiff admitted that he made those  
21 transfers and those transfers were made for the purchase of  
22 machines.

23 Furthermore, the machines at issue here, which were  
24 obtained from a manufacturer in China, were the subject of lots  
25 of activity at Redwood Scientific before the TRO was entered.

1 The FTC deposed Julie Green who worked for Redwood Scientific.  
2 And when Redwood Scientific was shut down by the receiver,  
3 immediately picked up her work with Alphatech Holdings, LLC,  
4 Mr. Poujade's LLC here, to do work on behalf of Pharmastrip or  
5 Clover Cannastrip or True Pharmastrip, however you want to  
6 refer to the work that was being done.

7 Ms. Green obfuscated and evaded many of our  
8 questions at deposition. But when we put e-mails in front of  
9 her between her and Mr. Cardiff and Mrs. Cardiff regarding a  
10 trip she took in September of 2018 to China to the machine  
11 manufacturer's location, she admitted that she was there at  
12 their behest doing Redwood business.

13 And, in fact, we can put in front of -- we can offer  
14 as exhibits today, if necessary, those printed out e-mails with  
15 Ms. Green's handwritten notes regarding the visit. There are  
16 notes about CloverStrips, the CBD product that Redwood  
17 Scientific was rolling out around the time that the FTC filed  
18 its Complaint.

19 Also regarding the machines and the ongoing business  
20 concern referenced by Mr. Poujade's counsel, we are talking  
21 about THC-containing strips here. And Mr. Spertus has made a  
22 number of comments about lawyers advising Mr. Poujade and the  
23 company about how to navigate various laws. Obviously under  
24 federal law there are implications here for the ongoing  
25 business.

1           And, finally, and I wish that I could -- I wish  
2   that my computer was connecting to the courtroom technology  
3   here, but I can point the Court to a place in the docket,  
4   Docket 134-21, page 20. The idea that True Pharmastrip, Inc.,  
5   as it is now known or Pharmastrip as the operation here in the  
6   U.S. seems to be referred to has nothing to do with the Redwood  
7   products or is somehow divorced from or separate from the  
8   Redwood common enterprise is a highly questionable claim based  
9   on the fact that on April 23rd of this year our investigator  
10  captured the dissolveresponsibly.com website, which is  
11  Pharmastrip's website, including where many of these products  
12  that Pharmastrip is marketing are displayed, and as part of  
13  that capture, captured a stop smoking product containing  
14  cytisine, the same ingredient as TBX-Free which is challenged  
15  in the Complaint, a male sexual performance product containing  
16  damiana and ginseng, these extracts, the same ingredients in  
17  Prolongs which is subject to this Complaint, as well as other  
18  quote/unquote "lifestyle products" or, as they might otherwise  
19  be known, dietary supplement-type products containing once  
20  again the same ingredients as previous Redwood products, and  
21  I'll give the Court three examples.

22           A stress relief product called Float containing or  
23  purportedly containing serotonin. A sleep aid. Mrs. Cardiff  
24  testified at the last hearing that one of the products Redwood  
25  was promoting before the TRO was a sleep aid. This product

1 purportedly contains melatonin. So does the product called  
2 Rested that was available and marketed on the  
3 dissolveresponsibly.com website in April. And finally, a  
4 multivitamin product again resembling a product previously sold  
5 by Redwood Scientific.

6 So the Court has seen evidence presented by the FTC  
7 of the Cardiffs' extensive plans for this business. We've also  
8 presented to the Court common uses of these common enterprise  
9 factors such as control people, the Cardiffs themselves,  
10 employees, Ms. Green being a primary example, but there are  
11 others, Justin Daines, Edgar Figueroa.

12 The use of the same addresses or physical office  
13 locations. Mr. Cardiff was using the 820 North Mountain Avenue  
14 business address to conduct Clover Cannastrip business. The  
15 only reason that Pharmastrip is no longer using that address is  
16 because now the receiver has taken possession of the premises.  
17 Mr. Cardiff was using his personal home address on Clover  
18 Cannastrip subscription agreements.

19 We have put into the record a declaration from  
20 Corina Grodek who worked for Pharmastrip for a month who  
21 observed Mr. Cardiff giving tours to potential investors of  
22 Pharmastrip on the business premises.

23 And, again, we haven't gotten to this issue yet, and  
24 the FTC can wait to address this, but the additional raised  
25 funds which nearly triple or more than triple the amount we

1 were talking about the last time we in this courtroom need to  
2 be addressed at some point.

3 So there's plenty of evidence of the Cardiffs'  
4 ongoing control. We have a statement --

5 THE COURT: Look, I recognize the egregious nature  
6 of the conduct of the Cardiffs, and I've expressed that openly  
7 in court today and then last time. And I also expressed that  
8 there should be a referral of this matter to the criminal  
9 authorities for possible criminal contempt.

10 But this is a civil proceeding, and I think there's  
11 so much more here that probably should be investigated in a  
12 different context.

13 MS. SANGER: Thank you, Your Honor. And I think  
14 that will -- I'll take your cue and rest regarding the  
15 machines. If you do -- if the Court would like to see any of  
16 the potential exhibits that I've referenced, the e-mails from  
17 Ms. Green to Mr. and Mrs. Cardiff regarding the machines and  
18 her trip to China to essentially seal the deal for the purchase  
19 of the machines, we do have them handy, and we could enter them  
20 into the record if the Court would desire.

21 THE COURT: Go ahead.

22 MR. SPERTUS: I won't unwind the facts that counsel  
23 is referencing as the bad things done by Mr. Cardiff. But I  
24 want to identify for the Court that the conduct for the  
25 acquisition of the machines was, according to the FTC,

1 October 2018. That is when the machines were purchased. They  
2 were purchased for the THC strips. Mr. Cardiff was involved at  
3 that time in October. When the TRO issued and the Complaint  
4 was filed, everything began to change, and as of today, he has  
5 nothing to do with the company.

6 So the company is an ongoing business. These  
7 machines were purchased with -- from the account that contained  
8 the 1.56 million that we are replenishing. So since the  
9 money that was used to pay for those machines -- and yes,  
10 Jason Cardiff was involved in their acquisition -- we are  
11 replacing the money to get the machines back hopefully.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Cardiff has so -- the Cardiffs have  
13 so poisoned the well here that the Court is not prepared to  
14 reach a conclusion at this time that they continue -- that they  
15 no longer have any involvement with the related companies.

16 Let me -- let me take a short recess, and we'll come  
17 back, and I'll make a decision regarding the machines.

18 MR. SPERTUS: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 THE CLERK: Court is in recess.

20 (At 10:53 a.m. a brief recess was taken.)

21 THE COURT: Please have a seat. We are back in  
22 session.

23 MR. SPERTUS: Mr. Poujade will be right back. He's  
24 in the men's room. He's on his way back.

25 THE COURT: Mr. Poujade?

1 MR. SPERTUS: Yeah. But we can proceed.

2 THE COURT: So in reference to the machines, I think  
3 the suggestion by the Court and the position taken by  
4 Mr. Spertus to allow the machines to be used under the  
5 jurisdiction of the Court, the parties would have to consent to  
6 the jurisdiction of the Court having authority over those  
7 machines to be decided at a later date based on new  
8 information. The machines can be used.

9 I'm -- it's not clear to me why a Colorado machine  
10 has to remain in Colorado and why a California machine has to  
11 remain in California, but I accept that there are certain  
12 nuances in the law that require that. And no one has suggested  
13 otherwise.

14 So the Court will allow the machines to be used as  
15 long as the receiver has knowledge of the location of the  
16 machines. And if there's any attempt to try to remove the  
17 machines or transfer the ownership of the machines, that would  
18 be brought to the attention of the Court.

19 The 1 -- with the deposit of 1.56 million with the  
20 custody of the receiver, it would seem to me, to the Court,  
21 that that would resolve the contempt proceedings before the  
22 Court today. There are other issues that the FTC has raised  
23 today, and that can be the subject of additional proceedings  
24 later on if the record -- when the record is more fully  
25 developed.

1           So I would also just state that allowing -- I want  
2 to make it clear that allowing the machines to be used by  
3 Pharmastrip, the Court is not condoning that they be used --  
4 personally condoning that they be used for a purpose that may  
5 be a violation of federal law. So that's -- the Court is not  
6 condoning that.

7           Do we have any -- what else has to be accomplished  
8 here today? I think we probably need a stipulation or a  
9 proposed stipulation and order to follow regarding the  
10 machines, the location, how the receiver can maintain some  
11 jurisdiction over those machines to make sure that they are  
12 maintained in a proper working order and not removed. And then  
13 we need to have an order that would cause the transfer of the  
14 1.56 million to the receiver.

15           MR. SPERTUS: Yes. We'll prepare one and send it to  
16 the receiver for comment and then file it.

17           Your Honor, there's one additional mechanical step.  
18 We then I believe will be filing a motion to intervene for the  
19 limited purpose of participating in discovery, True  
20 Pharmastrip. We'll talk internally about that. Perhaps we can  
21 reach a stipulation with the FTC to allow us to appear and  
22 engage in discovery.

23           THE COURT: That -- you can have those discussions  
24 with counsel for the FTC and see if that could be resolved.

25           I do think that there are -- there's some, you know,



1 serious effort by Pharmastrip to distance themselves from the  
2 conduct of the Cardiffs and others. Going forward, I  
3 appreciate the board being here today. And it appears that  
4 there are certain legitimate persons and businesspeople  
5 involved with that entity going forward. And so I'm hopeful  
6 that these issues can be resolved in the future.

7 MR. SPERTUS: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 MS. SANGER: Your Honor, I do wish to be heard  
9 regarding outstanding issues.

10 THE COURT: Go ahead.

11 MS. SANGER: Your Honor, the FTC has requested a  
12 full accounting including each deposit and credit to and each  
13 withdrawal or debit from the subject bank accounts as well as,  
14 you know, any records that are kept in the Sui trust account  
15 would be included in that request.

16 The records that we received late last Thursday are  
17 not complete. There's both redacted information in those  
18 records as well as some of the records appear only to go  
19 through about June 6th of this year.

20 THE COURT: I think that should be also ordered by  
21 the Court. A full and complete accounting should be included.

22 MS. SANGER: Thank you, Your Honor. And then just  
23 one remaining request from the FTC. We've been seeking  
24 communications between and among Mr. and Mrs. Cardiff and  
25 Mr. Poujade as well as their business associates so that we

1 have an opportunity to investigate and cross-examine these  
2 claims that the Cardiffs are no longer involved in the business  
3 at this point.

4 We have been met by refusal after refusal to turn  
5 over those communications. And we are seeking e-mails, text  
6 messages, encrypted chat messages. Mr. Cardiff testified at  
7 the last hearing that he had communicated with Mr. Poujade  
8 using several different encrypted chat messages -- or  
9 applications on his phone.

10 THE COURT: Well, I think that's probably an order  
11 also. Any communications or -- of any type between the  
12 Cardiffs and Mr. Poujade should be turned over.

13 MS. SANGER: Thank you, Your Honor. And if I --

14 THE COURT: Wait. Let me hear from Mr. Spertus. I  
15 see him standing. Yes?

16 MR. SPERTUS: Your Honor, I just am surprised to  
17 hear the FTC's calculation. When we appeared, which was I  
18 think the week before last, we've immediately collected data.  
19 We have 132,000 total e-mails from one account and 32 gigabytes  
20 of data from Mr. Poujade's phone including application data.

21 We communicated that to the FTC, sent them a  
22 proposed search term list. They have not responded, which they  
23 can take all the time they want. But they can't then stand  
24 before Your Honor and say we are refusing to produce that.

25 THE COURT: Okay. If you've cooperated and produced

1 those communications, that's fine. And hopefully this issue  
2 could be resolved going forward.

3 MR. SPERTUS: Yeah, we will resolve it. And the  
4 ball is in the FTC's court. Saying we proposed a protective  
5 order that they brought up today -- if the Court would just  
6 allow us to meet and confer to resolve these issues, we  
7 shouldn't have to involve the Court at all.

8 THE COURT: Ms. Sanger, I think it's probably a good  
9 idea to sit down and have communications with Mr. Spertus.

10 MS. SANGER: Yes, Your Honor. We are happy to  
11 continue -- excuse me. We are happy to continue to communicate  
12 with Mr. Spertus, and I'm happy to hear the update of the  
13 amount of data that's been collected and the number of e-mails.

14 To be clear, we are asking that the order also apply  
15 to the Cardiffs. And to date, we haven't received any  
16 communications from the Cardiffs.

17 THE COURT: To be clear, it applies to the Cardiffs.

18 MS. SANGER: Yes. And, Your Honor, given evidence  
19 in the record that Mr. Cardiff in the past has ordered the  
20 destruction of documents after receiving document requests from  
21 the FTC, we would actually propose to the Court today that the  
22 Court order the Cardiffs to turn their mobile phones over to  
23 the receiver so that they can be imaged by the FTC's forensic  
24 data analyst. We have a forensic data analyst standing by in  
25 DC who could board the next plane to Los Angeles, and they

1 could be returned to the Cardiffs immediately after they are  
2 imaged.

3 But we have serious concerns here that if the  
4 Cardiffs ever do apply -- every do comply with the Court's  
5 order to turn over the communications, that what we will  
6 receive will be a greatly reduced or altered set of  
7 communications and data.

8 We also would request this order to issue today  
9 because there is data in the phones themselves that could show  
10 attempted deletion or destruction of data or applications. And  
11 we believe the FTC should be the one harvesting the data rather  
12 than the Cardiffs.

13 MR. THURMAN: Your Honor, may I be heard on this?

14 THE COURT: Yes.

15 MR. THURMAN: Ms. Sanger failed to disclose the fact  
16 that when the request -- the recent request was made by the FTC  
17 for the Cardiffs to provide communications with Mr. Poujade and  
18 others, that the Cardiffs responded they will provide that  
19 information. And that information is also being gathered and  
20 collected right now.

21 This is a request being made to the Court that has  
22 never been made to the Cardiffs. So in effect, Ms. Sanger is  
23 assuming that they will not receive clean data that has not  
24 been manipulated or in any way altered and for that basis are  
25 demanding the opportunity to have a direct inspection. No

1 notice on this other than right now.

2 THE COURT: I am not surprised that Ms. Sanger has  
3 waited until today to raise the issue because if she raised the  
4 issue previously the Cardiffs may have taken action to delete  
5 or remove information contained on that phone. I would not be  
6 surprised. And, again, this case is so serious, the -- the  
7 civil proceeding here is simply not a proper mechanism to  
8 resolve all issues. It really should be a criminal proceeding.

9 The Court is going to order that the phones be  
10 produced. Do you have numbers -- how many phones are at issue?

11 MS. SANGER: Your Honor, based on the T-Mobile  
12 records in the record here, we believe there are two phones  
13 belonging to Mr. Cardiff and one phone belonging to  
14 Mrs. Cardiff.

15 THE COURT: Are you able to identify those phones  
16 today?

17 MS. SANGER: Yes, Your Honor. I would just need a  
18 second to pull it up in my records, the phone numbers.

19 MR. THURMAN: Your Honor, I simply ask that  
20 arrangements be made with whoever the person is that's going to  
21 be doing the pulling of the documents for any attorney-client  
22 communications to be segregated and shielded.

23 THE COURT: Yeah, that should be -- there should be  
24 a protocol in place to protect the -- any attorney-client  
25 communications.

1 MR. FLETCHER: Your Honor, Mike Fletcher on behalf  
2 of the receiver.

3 It's my understanding that the request for -- was  
4 for a turnover of phones today. I don't know whether the Court  
5 has ordered that or a turnover at some other point in time.

6 THE COURT: Let me hear from Ms. Sanger first.

7 MS. SANGER: Your Honor, I apologize. I was looking  
8 for the phone numbers, and I didn't hear the question.

9 THE COURT: Whether the phone should be turned over  
10 today as opposed to a date in the future.

11 MS. SANGER: Yes, Your Honor. We absolutely believe  
12 there should be an immediate turnover of the phones.

13 MR. THURMAN: Your Honor, one other concern I'd like  
14 to put before the Court on this issue is, as with most people,  
15 my understanding is the Cardiffs use their cell phones as their  
16 only way of communicating. I don't want to lose the ability to  
17 continue to communicate with them. Is there a way to set some  
18 kind of limitation on how much -- how long these phones will be  
19 removed from them so that they can -- we can continue to  
20 communicate with one another?

21 THE COURT: Look, I'm sure there's other ways that  
22 the parties could think of in terms of continued communication  
23 and also just purchasing or securing other phones. But the  
24 imaging should be conducted expeditiously and the phones  
25 returned.

1           How long is that going to take? What's your  
2       proposal for turning over the phones today, Ms. Sanger?

3           MS. SANGER: Yes, Your Honor. I can provide a few  
4       specifics. We will fly our forensic data analyst from  
5       Washington, D.C. to Los Angeles. As I stated earlier, he can  
6       board the next available flight to get here.

7           Once here, we can image several phones at once. So  
8       this process could take place simultaneously with the three  
9       phones that Mr. Cardiff and Mrs. Cardiff have been using.  
10      Depending on the amount of data on the phone, this process  
11      could take one to two hours or probably max in the range of 20,  
12      24 hours. So we are talking about a relatively short period of  
13      time here.

14           Also to address the concern raised by the Cardiffs'  
15      counsel, we do have a protocol in place for how we collect this  
16      data. We would use a similar protocol to what we employed on  
17      October 12th when we went in for the immediate access to  
18      protect potentially privileged communications.

19           I will also note that the Cardiffs have waived their  
20      attorney-client privilege as to information about their assets.  
21      So that's a potential factor that may play into which  
22      information is reviewable.

23           And then once imaged, we would return them to the  
24      receiver to be returned to the Cardiffs or to the Cardiffs'  
25      counsel. We do need to ask that as part of this turnover

1 order, that they be turned over unlocked with the passwords  
2 available so that when it comes time to image the phones, the  
3 forensic data analyst can access the phone to perform that  
4 imaging.

5 And to the extent that there are additional  
6 encryption keys or passwords associated with the chat apps, for  
7 example, potentially an additional password to access WhatsApp  
8 or Signal, that those passwords or encryption keys will also  
9 need to be identified to the receiver and turned over with the  
10 phones so that the imaging can be accomplished.

11 THE COURT: Ms. Sanger, you are very thorough, and  
12 that would be the order of the Court.

13 MS. SANGER: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: So we have -- where are the phones? I  
15 need the phone numbers, and then we have to determine where the  
16 phones are right now.

17 MS. SANGER: Yes, Your Honor. I have just quickly  
18 pulled up one of the T-Mobile phone records in our records  
19 here. And I believe that the phone numbers at issue are  
20 (646) 526-3840, (909) 816-9662, and (951) 333-0609.

21 I would just ask the Court's permission -- we will  
22 do a second check on these phone numbers just to make sure that  
23 I haven't missed anything or that I haven't misstated one of  
24 the numbers. I've just looked at one of the statements. And  
25 to be absolutely thorough, I would like to just touch base with



1 our investigator. But these are the three phones that we  
2 believe are in their possession.

3 THE COURT: So we need all this reduced to writing.  
4 So I would order counsel, Mr. Spertus and Ms. Sanger, to -- and  
5 the receiver to sit down, meet and confer regarding a proposed  
6 order that the Court can execute concerning the transfer of the  
7 monies to the custody of the receiver and also the preservation  
8 of the machines but the machines to be used by Pharmastrip  
9 going forward and then a separate order concerning the phones  
10 themselves.

11 MS. SANGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: And so the question, Mr. Thurman, is  
13 where are your client's phones today? They probably should  
14 be -- I would order that they be provided to you --

15 MR. THURMAN: Thank you.

16 THE COURT: -- and that you retain control of those  
17 phones until the forensic analyst from Washington, D.C. is able  
18 to receive them. And then all of this should be conducted  
19 within a 48-hour period from the date that the phones are  
20 turned over to the analyst. Is that -- that gives you plenty  
21 of time.

22 MS. SANGER: That sounds reasonable, Your Honor.  
23 And we will work with Mr. Spertus then to arrange a transfer  
24 time or pick up time for the transfer -- for imaging the  
25 phones.

1 THE COURT: That's Mr. Thurman.  
2 MS. SANGER: Excuse me. Yes, Mr. Thurman.  
3 THE COURT: Anything further today?  
4 MR. THURMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.  
5 MR. SPERTUS: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  
6 THE COURT: Thank you. We're adjourned.  
7 (At 11:21 a.m. the proceedings adjourned.)  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

I, MAREA WOOLRICH, FEDERAL OFFICIAL REALTIME COURT  
REPORTER, IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT PURSUANT  
TO SECTION 753, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE THAT THE FOREGOING  
IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF THE STENOGRAPHICALLY  
REPORTED PROCEEDINGS HELD IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER AND THAT  
THE TRANSCRIPT PAGE FORMAT IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE  
REGULATIONS OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES.

DATED THIS 5TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2019.

/S/ MAREA WOOLRICH

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAREA WOOLRICH, CSR NO. 12698, CCRR  
FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER